



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

old as Spenser is attested by Cotgrave's *sommier*, 'a sumpter-horse, also the piece of timber called a summer.' In the sense of 'pack-horse' it goes back to *King Alisaunder* 850, as noted by Skeat. The *NED*. does not yet cover that portion of the alphabet, and will perhaps give us other examples.

As is now clear, *underlay*—doubtless used for rime instead of *underlie*—has been incorrectly glossed by Spenser editors to meet this one passage, since it means no more than we should expect, 'underlie, lie under.' The word *summer-beam*, too, adequately represents Latin *laqueare*, altho it has hitherto not been reported in any literary use, so far as I can find. Thus a new word comes to light in the old poet, and another ghost word or ghost meaning—*underlay*² in an impossible sense—is laid to rest.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

Western Reserve University.

BRIEF MENTION

Christianopolis: an Ideal State of the Seventeenth Century. Translated from the Latin of Johann Valentin Andreae, with an Historical Introduction, by Felix Emil Held (New York, Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1916). In *Mr. Britling Sees It Through*, Miss Corner, who was reading Campanella's *Civitas Solis*, "asked Mr. Carmine why there were no Indian or Chinese Utopias." As a literary type the 'Ideal State' has had a long and varied history, and a retrospective view of that history has, naturally enough, resulted in confident—and over-confident—judgments as to the national, political, or social conditions most favorable to the production of a utopia. That the type will long continue to be attractive and be held available for timely instruction is attested by the experience of Miss Corner and by the author of *Erehwon*. Running parallel with the normal course of the type, there may always be expected some continuation of the feeble line of the perverted form of the type, represented by Hall's *Mundus Alter et Idem* and the recent travesty entitled *Upsidonia*. It might be argued that the time is now ripe for a new utopia of the most instructive sort, philosophic, scientific, and practical in character. The suggestion for such a composition is given, it might be argued, in the wide-spread questioning of the social order; in the bewildering tolerance of theorizing and of experimentation in education and in economics; in the rapid readjustments of life to prac-

² *Underlayes* for *underlies* occurs in this passage only, and *lays* for *lies* only once in Spenser, that is *Faerie Queene* vi, viii, 49.

tical and artistic devices made possible by progress in the natural sciences; in the progress of medical science; and in the revisions of traditional customs and beliefs,—an incomplete list of comprehensive subjects that pertain to the notable characteristics of the present period. High qualifications in comprehensive knowledge and in constructive power would be required to survey and to apply to an ideal commonwealth the forward-pointing results and theories attending present-day endeavor to increase knowledge and promote human welfare. The timeliness of a new utopia is certainly not contradicted by the necessity of assuming wider and more varied implications in applying to the present the words of the philosopher Windelband (quoted by Mr. Held, p. 9 f.), in which he describes the conditions that led to the production of utopias in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: "A new epoch of culture seemed to have been opened and an exotic agitation seized the imagination. Unheard of things were to be attained; nothing was to be impossible any more. . . . Science strove to be the leader of human thought in its victorious course through nature. Through her discoveries human life was to be completely transformed."

Mr. Held's book is published in a Series of Monographs entitled Germanic Literature and Culture, which is edited by Professor Goebel at the University of Illinois. It is to be inferred that the book represents Mr. Held's doctoral dissertation, and it is not altogether free of that variety of special pleading or of that undue emphasis on selected details which a young scholar finds difficult to avoid under the official stress of being required to make a contribution to knowledge. What has been undertaken is to prove that the following four assumptions are true: (1) that the *Christianopolis* is "an independent and original production," owing nothing to earlier utopias; (2) that the author of the *New Atlantis* probably knew the *Christianopolis*; (3) that the *Nova Solyma* "shows direct influence of the *Christianopolis*"; and (4) "that the principles of a general reformation in education and the plan of a 'college' as outlined in the *Christianopolis* and other works of Andreae were an important factor, through J. A. Comenius, Samuel Hartlib, John Dury, and their associates, in the founding of the Royal Society of London." This is an ascending series of points of interest, and its mere statement will impel the critical reader to omit the argument until he has either recalled to his mind the *Christianopolis* or has made himself acquainted for the first time with the work to which so much of importance is here attached. He will, therefore, begin by reading Mr. Held's translation of the Latin original, which, being the first translation into English, will be welcomed also by the general reader as an addition to accessible utopias.

In his discriminating and on the whole convincing defense of his first proposition (pp. 16-40), Mr. Held reviews and combats

preceding judgments of the relation of Andreae's work to More's *Utopia* and Campanella's *Civitas Solis*. This leads into a consideration of the chief features of the works considered,—which is well done. An occasional reflection connects the matter with present theories: "Education, by means of sugar-coated and pre-digested capsules of knowledge, is too much the tendency in our day" (p. 36); and again, "It is not the liberal and modern 'eugenic' view of the *Civitas Solis*, readjusted to the 'prosaic monotony of an orthodox-protestant town'" (p. 38).

Coming to his second proposition, Mr. Held is concerned (pp. 41-74) with Bacon's knowledge of and indebtedness to Andreae, and with the points of agreement between these authors in mental attitude and speculative theory and purpose. He finds connecting links between them in the careers of Casaubon, Weckherlin, and Sir Toby Matthew, and "inner evidence" of Bacon's familiarity with the foreign utopia and the *Fama Fraternitas*. He then turns to consider (pp. 75-99) the next most important utopia produced in England in the seventeenth century, the *Nova Solyma* (1648), now to be accepted as the work of Samuel Gott, whose relation with Milton may be inferred from their contemporary careers at Cambridge. The indebtedness of Gott to Andreae is argued in detail and is believed to be confirmed by the presumption that Gott "was in all probability in the circle of Andreae's best friends and warmest admirers—Dury, Hartlib, Comenius, and others—and that he was interested in exactly the same sort of a reformation of society" as that which was the aim of Andreae.

The highest pitch of interest is reached in Mr. Held's final discussion (pp. 100-125) of the evidence in favor of the belief that the influence of Andreae culminated in the founding of the Royal Society of London. This is contrary to the judgment of Spratt, who "gives Germany credit for a very small share" in this matter. Mr. Held must be thanked for having shown the long persistence of an after-glow of Andreae's influence; but the particular point of his contention is not convincingly cleared of improbabilities. It is, of course, a matter that is not susceptible of absolute proof, but Mr. Held has put it into a light that will arouse fresh attention.

J. W. B.

The publication of much new material gives importance to Professor G. McL. Harper's *William Wordsworth, His Life, Works, and Influence* (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916). Bishop Wordsworth's *Memoirs*, 1851, an act of family, almost filial, piety, and made up, as it was, largely from the poet's autobiographic memoranda, excluded what might have offended living people and what was out of harmony with the elaborate tradition which Words-

worth, consciously or otherwise, had built up during his later years. The same limitations acted with equal force in the case of Knight's *Letters of the Wordsworth Family*. Without inquiring how Professor Harper won the privilege of making use of hitherto unpublished documents, and premising that there can now be no objection to the revelation of facts contained therein, one may come at once to the question: What is this new material? That which comes from Mr. Gordon Wordsworth is of first importance, and second only to it is the series of letters from Dorothy Wordsworth to Jane Pollard, publication of which is now permitted by the latter's grandson. The startling new fact, the one inevitably ignored by Bishop Wordsworth and probably unknown to Knight, and the one seized upon by various reviewers and made matter for comment in different moods according to the individual's faculty of reverence, is of course the announcement of the "unfortunate attachment" made in France in 1792, when Wordsworth fell in love with a girl named Annette (known in later life as Mme. Vallon) and had by her a daughter, Caroline. Annette was a royalist, Wordsworth a Republican; marriage was impossible. Harper deduces good evidence to show that Wordsworth attempted to keep in touch with her after England and France were at war; he seems even to have visited France a second time in 1792. It is certain that before their marriage Wordsworth made what we call "a clean breast" of the business to his wife; that just prior to that event he went with his sister to Calais where he met the mother and daughter (on which occasion, when in company with his daughter, he wrote "It is a beauteous evening"; note that Knight believed that the "dear child" of this sonnet was a certain Caroline, though he was unable to identify her); that in 1815 he assisted in arranging the marriage of Caroline to a Captain Baudoin; and that in 1820, again in Paris, he took H. C. Robinson to call upon Mme. Vallon and the Baudoins. Professor John Bailey is right in saying (*Quarterly Review*, July, 1916, p. 117) that "taken as a whole, it is a story not of vice, but of virtue; not of weakness, but of strength"; but a sane judgment will add that Byron, to whom Wordsworth applied such adjectives as "infamous," "damnable," "despicable," showed a like sense of responsibility in the case of Allegra—and did not conceal the matter. The new letters of Dorothy Wordsworth are quite as charming as those already known and are biographically important for the increased emphasis which they force upon Wordsworth's early radicalism and on the consequent offence to members of his family. There are many other minor contributions to our knowledge of Wordsworth's life.

Professor Harper follows and outstrips Legouis in shifting emphasis from Wordsworth's later to his earlier life. He writes (I, 7): "Since it is that later man whom we find represented in a dozen portraits and innumerable anecdotes . . . the earlier and far more attractive Wordsworth is almost entirely obscured." All the

writer's sympathy goes out to the earlier man; towards the later he is often harsh, even satirical. His central thesis may be stated in his own words (I, 6): "Up to a certain point he was guided by hope; later he was driven by fear. The two halves of his life are incongruous." Harper believes that the influence of Godwin was stronger and more personal than has been generally held. He lays new stress upon the effect on Wordsworth of intellectual activity at Cambridge (the existence of which he proves amply enough). He insists that the poet's "apostasy" consisted at first solely in his opposition to Napoleon; that England was embraced merely as the best available representative of liberty, with full consciousness of her inadequacy; and that Wordsworth's full acceptance of the Tory position was the growth of years. Once arrived at that point, Harper is inclined to exaggerate the "apostasy," to the degree even of considering Wordsworth's work during political elections as something to be reprehended. Indeed, his general radicalism tinges uncritically much of Harper's narrative of the poet's later life. This is due in part to the writer's almost exclusive interest (remarkable in a professor of belles-lettres) in the political and social element in Wordsworth's work.

Professor Bailey, in the review already referred to, has said more than enough of Harper's style. Whether or not the study of the Works and Influence be acceptable must depend in part upon the individual, and in any case discussion of the question would transcend allotted space. But attention may be called to a few of the many curious comments that are found throughout the book. Note such remarks as: "In perfection and range of technical skill Wordsworth is unsurpassed" (I, 2): "He has attempted all things, accomplished all things" (*ibid.*); "How immensely varied his excellence is, how wide his appeal, how he transcends and embraces the special domains of almost all the English poets who were his contemporaries" (I, 5). Harper (II, 7) takes issue with Knight who thinks that Wordsworth showed true critical judgment in suppressing the portion of *The Recluse* that was completed. He contends on the contrary that in this poem he at times followed Milton on close wing, quoting in support of this view the very lines—they are indeed splendid—that Wordsworth singled out for separate publication in the prefatory note to *The Excursion*. Their citation serves rather to support than to confute Knight's opinion. In 1803 Wordsworth, like all patriots, volunteered for military service in case of an invasion; Harper remarks (II, 72): "Odious as it is to see him in a bloodthirsty mood, we must realize that the tide has turned." He thinks that *The Waggoner* falls into a class with other poems that depend upon the fancy, among them *Childe Harold*, though he admits that it does not equal them "in sportive grace" (II, 112). Has this trait ever before been singled out as the distinctive characteristic of *Childe Harold*? He denies that *The Happy Warrior* was inspired by the career of Lord Nelson,

roundly asserting (II, 119) : "I attach only the smallest consequence to the note appended to the poem" and dismissing in equally cavalier fashion the Fenwick note to the same effect and a letter from Southey to Scott that supports Wordsworth's statement. According to what canons of criticism would Professor Harper justify the rejection of such definite evidence? Note finally that the immortal lines "If thou indeed derive thy light from heaven," which all Wordsworthians and most other men should know by heart, are called by Harper a "sonnet" (II, 337).

S. C. C.

Were the *Traité pratique de prononciation française* of Maurice Grammont (Paris, Delagrave, 1916? 231 pp. 2.50 fr.), simply what similar titles usually indicate, a manual of the pronunciation of French sounds and words, it would call for no special remark. There are in this domain more detailed and more practical handbooks, such as Martinon's *Comment on prononce le français*. But it is not on this section ("Les Phonèmes isolés," pp. 9-97) that an estimate of the value of the book is based, but on the second part ("Le Mot et la phrase," pp. 99-194). Here we find a number of enlightening expositions of delicate problems in fields where Mr. Grammont's studies give weight to all he says. Nearly all the space in this second part is devoted to two subjects: the treatment of the *e muet* (or better, as he terms it, the *e caduc*) and the problems of stress and intonation.

Foreigners find it particularly difficult to acquire the French feeling for where and when the *e caduc* is to be omitted, above all if it occurs in two successive monosyllables. Mr. Grammont's classification is the most systematic that has been attempted, and the general rules he evolves show that no little order prevails in this seeming domain of confusion, and point clearly toward the causes which have brought about the present status.

It is refreshing to deal with a work that makes a clear-cut distinction between French phrase accent and rhetorical accent (Grammont: *accent d'insistance*) and attempts to determine the differences between the two and their effect upon each other. The field is broad and largely virgin, and the chapter devoted to it is rich in interesting suggestions. This, with the chapter on rhythmic groups, constitutes the newest and most fruitful section of the book. Hardly less important is the analysis of the different types of rhythm in French prose and of the stylistic effects they produce. The work forms an excellent pendant to the author's *Vers français* and his *Petit Traité de versification française*, and every worker in French linguistics and every teacher of French will be repaid for a reading of its clear and stimulating discussions.

E. C. A.